



**CITY OF ST. PETERSBURG
COMMUNITY PLANNING & PRESERVATION COMMISSION
PUBLIC HEARING**

**Council Chambers, City Hall
175 – 5th Street North
St. Petersburg, Florida 33701**

**August 9, 2022
Tuesday
2:00 P.M.**

MINUTES

Present: Lisa Wannemacher, Vice Chair
Manitia Moultrie
Valarie Nussbaum-Harris
Thomas “Tom” Whiteman
E. Alan Brock, Alternate
Jeffery “Jeff” M. Wolf, Alternate
Will Michaels, Alternate

Commissioners Absent: Sharon Winters, Chair

Staff Present: Derek Kilborn, Manager, Urban Planning & Historic Preservation
Laura Duvekot, Historic Preservationist, II
Kelly Perkins, Historic Preservationist, II
Britton Wilson, Planner II
Ann Vickstrom, Planner II
Heather Judd, Assistant City Attorney
Michael Dema, Managing Assistant Attorney
Katherine Connell, Clerk, Planning & Development Svcs.

The public hearing was called to order at 2:10 p.m., a quorum was present.

I. OPENING REMARKS OF CHAIR

II. ROLL CALL

III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE AND SWEARING IN OF WITNESSES

IV. MINUTES (Approval of 7/12 Minutes)

The minutes from the July 12, 2022, meeting were approved unanimously

V. PUBLIC COMMENTS

VII. QUASI-JUDICIAL HEARING

A. City File ZM-13

Contact People: Britton Wilson 551-3542

Request: Amendment to the Official Zoning Map from Retail Center-2 (RC-2) to Retail Center-3 (RC-3) for a 0.12-acre site located in the Echelon City Center at 150 Fountain Parkway North.

Staff Presentation

Britton Wilson, Planner II, gave a presentation based on the Staff Report.

Commissioner Michaels: A question, on page 6, this is Policy CM10B, where it says, the required balancing review criteria for property requesting an increase in density in the CHHA through a Future Land Use Map amendment. However, no residential development is planned at the subject location. There is also reference to, page 7 number 3 there is reference to a master plan which has been approved for 1,505 multi-family units. The question is, that while no residential development is being planned for this particular development, is it possible for a residential development to be added at a later date?

Britton Wilson: The site plan I had up earlier, it identified where the residential is, and I believe that is the Echelon WaterView Building that was just finished being built and it is completed. The Applicant can address whether or not there are more units proposed to be built or not.

Steve Kurcan: Good afternoon madame chair and commission, my name is Steven Kurcan and I am Sr. VP of Development and Construction for Echelon. At this time, we do not have any plans for residential at that location. There could be in the future, until the entire development is in the Coastal High Hazard Area, we are following all of the requirements of the Coastal High Hazard Area. In fact what we are doing in all of our residential developments that we are doing is a podium build where we have retail, parking and then residential on the top. The residential units are 60 to 70 feet up in the air. We are following all of the requirements of the Coastal high Hazard Area.

Commissioner Michaels: Thank you I am giving heavy weight to the fact that the surrounding area is all RC-3, and this seems to be an anomaly here.

Applicant/Agent Presentation

Applicant was available for comments or questions.

Registered Opponent

None.

Public Hearing

None.

Cross Examination:

City Staff and Applicant Waived.

Rebuttal/Closing Remarks

City Staff and Applicant Waived.

Executive Session

Commissioner Wannemacher: Do any of the commissioners have any comments or questions for staff or the applicant?

Commissioner Nussbaum-Harris: I think Commissioner Michaels made a valid point that it is an anomaly and yes, this should be included in the general Master Plan for that area, I concur.

Commissioner Wannemacher: Thank you, anybody else? May I have a motion?

Motion: Commissioner Whiteman moved approval to City Council the proposal to the Official Zoning Map amendment to the Official Zoning Map from Retail Center-2 (RC-2) to Retail Center-3 (RC-3) for a 0.12-acre site located in the Echelon City Center at 150 Fountain Parkway North.

Commissioner Nussbaum-Harris, Second.

YES – 7 - Wannemacher, Moultrie, Nussbaum-Harris, Whiteman, Brock, Michaels, Wolf
NO – 0

Motion passed unanimously.

B. City File ZM-12

Contact People: Britton Wilson 551-3542

Request: Amendment to the Official Zoning Map from Corridor Commercial Suburban (CCS-1) to Corridor Commercial Traditional – 1 (CCT-1) for a 14.5-acre site consisting of two separate parcels located at 4350 6th Street South and 575 45th Ave. S.

Staff Presentation

Britton Wilson, Planner II, gave a presentation based on the Staff Report.

Applicant/Agent Presentation

Agent, Craig Taraszki, Esq., Johnson Pope, gave a presentation in support of the zoning change and the proposed project and was available for questions.

Commissioner Wannemacher: I have a question, the zoning change, this is also for the Staff, does the zoning change prohibit the development of retail on the residential portion of the property?

Craig Taraszki: No.

Commissioner Wannemacher: Thank you have you completed the design of the residential portion of the property?

Craig Taraszki: We have a site plan application in process.

Commissioner Wannemacher: Okay.

Commissioner Nussbaum-Harris: I do have a couple of questions, for the Applicant. Can you give us an idea of what the commercial development is expected to look like?

Marc Rios: The rendering is pretty accurate to what the commercial portion...

Commissioner Nussbaum-Harris: I mean more like use; do you have an idea of what potential tenants are interested in the space? Or who you would anticipate will be interested?

Denise Kelly: My name is Denise Kelly; I am a Development Manager with Stoneweg here in St. Pete.

Commissioner Wannemacher: Could you please speak into the microphone, state your address and whether you have been sworn in, please?

Denise Kelly: My name is Denise Kelly, I am a development manager with Stoneweg, I have been sworn in, and my address is 1380 Duncan Loop S., I have been working closely with our retail broker on the retail portion of the project and we have made very, very concerted efforts, trying to get a grocery store. We have reached out to sixty three (63) brokers and brokerage companies, we have reached out to over fifteen (15) major chain grocers and then over 100 other retailers including smaller boutique grocers. We are currently in conversations with some of those smaller grocers, the reason that we have not been able to attract a major chain is that their selection criteria which includes population demographics. Basically, not enough people live in the area to support a grocer that has a larger footprint. We shifted strategies and we are trying to attract a smaller sized grocer who is aligned with the population in the area, as well as supporting local ownership and local businesses. We have six (6) interested parties that we are speaking to and are in contract negotiations with currently and that is where we are today.

Commissioner Wannemacher: Thank you, commissioner, did that answer your question?

Commissioner Nussbaum-Harris: It did, but I have a follow up question. How many square feet of commercial are we looking at?

Denise Kelly: Just over 20,000 sq. ft.

Commissioner Nussbaum-Harris: Thank you.

Denise Kelly: And, we were just talking, the people we are talking to, the smaller grocers, a coffee shop, a small boutique food source and a fitness studio, and I think I mentioned the coffee shop.

Commissioner Wannemacher: Thank you.

Registered Opponent

Walter Borden gave a presentation in opposition of the proposed project.

Commissioner Nussbaum-Harris: Sir, you made a comment about Winn-Dixie, I am curious as to how and why you know that what information you have on that.

Walter Borden: A little over a year ago I had a conversation with Marc Rios who is sitting right over here, he told me that Winn-Dixie was willing to go on the site, they wanted forty thousand (40,000) some odd feet space, which is more than they were willing to allocate, and they were not able to be there until 2024. Now I know they want to build the retail space before they build the apartments, but 2024 is just around the corner, I am a commercial developer of solar, and let me tell you what, we are specing out in 2024 and 2025 projects out, today. So, this is a construction project that is going to take...

Commissioner Nussbaum-Harris: So, you got your information from Marc Rios?

Walter Borden: I got it directly from Marc, yes.

Public Hearing

Tom Lally, 6702 31st Way S., opposed
Liza Daaka, 316 37th Ave. S., opposed
Susan Phillips, 187 47th Ave. N., support
Roy Hastings, 360 4th Ave. S., opposed
Rich Lander, 4635 Neptune Dr. SE, unavailable.
Anne Ferrante Gosh, 301 62nd Ave. S., opposed
Mike McGraw, 3997 Beach Dr. SE, opposed
Kyle Parks, 1011 14th St. N., support
Nancy Frainetti, 3750 Whiting Dr. SE, opposed
Barbara Poore, 236 58th Ave. S., opposed
Winston Miller, 700 Jasmine Way, S., support
Steven Barefield, 5036 Casilla Way S., opposed
Marie Fivecoat, 4343 Juanita Way, 4663 and 3811 Neptune Dr. SE, opposed

Rose Wetherell, 290 37th Ave. SE, opposed
Renee Kongsiri, 4908 Sunrise Dr. S., opposed
Walter Carfora, 123 17th Ave SE, opposed
Shawn Siede, Sr., 4375 Menhaden Dr. SE, opposed
Patricia Meyers, 4029 Miramar Way S., opposed
Bonnie Rivensark, 111 63rd Circle S., did not identify for or against, unavailable.
Mirela Setkic, 4200 25th Ave. N., opposed
Mark Spencer, 3494 Coquina Key Dr. SE, opposed
Pam Muller, 3520 Coquina Key Dr. SE, opposed
Edna Reedy, 4218 4th St. S., opposed
Tommy Todd, 6310 Bahama Shores Dr. S., opposed
Francis Smith, 6 Sea Lane S., opposed
Kathy Michaels, 621 Bahama Shores Dr. S., opposed
Ronald Hiemann, 4675 Neptune Dr. SE, did not identify for or against, unavailable.
J. Pezdeh, 145 59th Ave. S., opposed
Carol Sales, 4156 Coquina Key Dr. SE, opposed
Tom Barry, 4011 Sunrise Dr. S., opposed 2:00

Cross Examination:

City Staff and Owner Waived.

Registered Opponent, Walter Borden: Under CCS-1 in areas greater than 5 acres, the residential component is not to exceed forty percent (40%), of total F.A.R. My question is, is that the real reason that we want to go to traditional zoning for this property, to be able to increase?

Unrecognizable: It is not.

Walter Borden: Okay, then it is not, why?

Commissioner Wannemacher: Legal?

Attorney Dema: Chair, I am not sure who that question is directed to.

Walter Borden: To the developer,

Attorney Dema: The developer, well then, will the representative that presented the testimony for the developer, Mr. Taraszki.

Craig Taraszki: Can you repeat the question please?

Walter Borden: The question is, under CCS-1 zoning, properties that are over five acres residential component should not exceed forty percent (40%) of the total F.A.R., my question is, is that the real reason that we are here to get a zoning variance to traditional rather than suburban?

Craig Taraszki: That is not a cross examination of testimony I have presented today.

Commissioner Wannemacher: No, it is not. I am sorry, no. Do you have any other?

Walter Borden: There is one thing, I had a conversation with Marc Rios about the Winn-Dixie property going into forty thousand (40,000+) or more space in 2024 and I have also been told that the Save-a-Lot wanted to renew, but was either...

Craig Taraszki: Objection, this is not...

Walter Borden: My question is.

Commissioner Wannemacher: Again, it is not really, you are not commenting on, none of that was included in their testimony.

Walter Borden: My question about their testimony is, who they talked to, actually what are the conversations they have had with these retailers?

Commissioner Wannemacher: Mr. Taraszki, do you want to answer, who you have spoken to regarding retailers?

Walter Borden: And, I guess, what size, how much space is being offered?

Marc Rios: Marc Rios, Director of Development at Stoneweg, regarding my conversation with Walter, yes, with Winn-Dixie we did have conversations with Winn-Dixie through our retail broker, this is about a year ago. At that point in time, we were speaking to them, but they made no commitments and that commitment fell through, they lost interest. On the Save-a-Lot as well, we were in talks with them, but we could not make it work, there was no commitment from them, so they lost interest as well.

Commissioner Wannemacher: Thank you.

Craig Taraszki: Can I ask to re-direct on that?

Commissioner Wannemacher: As long as it is pertinent to the testimony that they gave.

Walter Borden: They did not respond to the full question; how many square feet were they offering either of those?

Craig Taraszki: That is not a cross examination questions.

Commissioner Wannemacher: Again, they did not include that in their original testimony.

Rebuttal/Closing Remarks

Britton Wilson: I just have a general statement to make, the area is a mix of more suburban than traditional, but it is in a traditional transition zone. The density that the traditional zoning will provide will help generate the support needed for the market to require and support the needed

retail and the requested retail.

Walter Borden: I would just like to say, as we said earlier, we really need sixty five thousand (65,000), square feet for grocery and pharmacy and that makes perfect sense for what everybody has talked about here. I think that the offer of twenty thousand (20,000) square feet, half of which is already given away to who knows what, is not adequate.

Commissioner Wannemacher: Thank you. Mr. Taraszki?

Craig Taraszki: Craig Taraszki for the applicant, thank you again. We have heard a lot about the need for a grocer, we have heard about traffic and about height, but we are asking you today to do is to rezone the property from CCS-1 to CCT-1. This is not a site plan review, a lot of the concerns about Levels of Service, parking, traffic, those are site plan issues that will be considered during the site plan review process that will go before DRC (Development Review Commission). You should look at this rezoning as progress. The reason why we do not have a restaurant on the site, because as you heard, is it does not meet the site criteria for grocers, pharmacies or other vendors. Redeveloping this site and adding these residential units mixed use development will hopefully move the needle, not just this development, Lake Maggiore and hopefully developers that come in behind and further redevelop South St. Petersburg. If we miss this opportunity to develop the site, it may be a couple of decades before we hit that criterion before a grocer, or the other vendors may want to come in and serve this population. The areas to the West and the South are predominately suburban, the suburban form of subdivision it is inherently car centric, large yards, driveways, it doesn't necessarily promote walkability. What we are asking you today is to rezone this to a traditional zoning district, it will bring within that transition area, traditional is consistent with the blocks to the North. Within the proposed development it will be mixed use, there will be some services onsite, it will be walkable, so it enhances that aspiration to be walkable. Again, we are not asking for any future land use change here, you are looking long range planning tool contemplates thirty (30) dwelling units on the site plus an optional workforce housing bonus. We are asking for twenty four (24) plus workforce that is under what your long range planning is for this site. That type of density was already contemplated. The large tract development standards that would allow one hundred and fifty (150) feet of height, we have heard people objecting to the seventy-seven (77), that we are going to restrict by the Development Agreement (DA). The existing CCS-1 could utilize large tract, could go up to one hundred and fifty (150), feet on this site without coming to you for rezoning. The rezoning does not change that piece of this project. The other great thing about this site is it is on 66th Street South which is designated as Secondary Multi-modal Corridor and the County Land Wide Strategy Map, it is categorized as a major street in the city's Comp Plan (Comprehensive Plan) and is an Investment Corridor in the Advantage Pinellas Plan. We have high frequency public transit, that is PST Route 4, that runs along 6th Street. It is also an 18-minute bike ride from Coquina Key Plaza to the Publix on Central Ave. It is inherently multi-modal for this site. The folks want you to require a grocer on the site, there is nothing in your rezoning criteria or considerations that would allow this body to add that type of use requirement on this site as CCS-1 and CCT-1 are mixed use zoning districts, they both will allow retail, commercial grocers so that does not change whether it is rezoned or not. The city's own Tangerine Plaza property in South St. Pete, they just reopened the RFP on that, and they reduced the number on non-residential component from about forty thousand (40,000) square feet to ten thousand (10,000) square feet. So, the city's own RFP recognizes the market for retail right

now. That is all I have for today, I would appreciate your recommendation for approval, thank you.

Executive Session

Commissioner Wannemacher: Fellow commissioners, do you have comments, who would like to start? Commissioner Brock, would you like to start?

Commissioner Brock: Thank you Chair, I have listened to many of the citizens speak here today, I do think many of them addressed more outside of what we are voting on today. What we are voting on today is to change this from the Suburban to the Traditional Commercial Corridor, which does increase the density allowed but it also keeps it in line with the walkable way they are looking for. It is a nice way; I agree with the transition idea that has been brought up today. The Development Agreement which is not part of what we have to vote on, does say that they are prioritizing that they are trying to do their best to bring in a grocery store.

Attorney Dema: I am going to stop you right there commissioner, that Development Agreement is something you are voting on today.

Commissioner Brock: We are, okay, I apologize.

Attorney Dema: There is zoning and the Development Agreement.

Commissioner Bock, my apologizes, but it does say they are prioritizing bringing in a grocery store, or a place that will be selling fresh fruits and vegetables. I thought it was an additional document, my apologizes. This seems to be, from my experience with planning and development in the past, my understanding is that you are going to need more density to get some of the things that they want. This helps bring that density about so that they can get the grocery stores they are aiming for. Right now, I am inclined to support this initiative.

Commissioner Wannemacher: Thank you, anyone else?

Commissioner Whiteman: I have a question for staff. Hearing all this testimony, does it change your opinion as to whether this meets the comprehensive plan and Vision2050?

Britton Wilson: Yes, madame chair, Commissioner Whiteman, I think you might be referring to the opposition statement, or their objection that it does not meet or comply with StPete2050's vision and it does not provide sufficient enough core retail goods and services within walkable distance.

Commissioner Whiteman: Yes

Britton Wilson: It is currently indetermined what retail options will be in the future. This rezoning pretty much allows almost all of the commercial options available to the site. Again, no site plan is being considered or approved today. The site plan they have proposed can be updated, it can be withdrawn, I do feel this proposal is consistent with the StPete2050 vision.

Commissioner Whiteman: Thank you.

Commissioner Wolf: Having listened to the concerns today, what I see on the zoning, is that this change in zoning does not address those concerns. There can still be a residential component that is not as large, if we change it, there is more allowable residential, but it is still an allowed component. Commercial is still allowed under both zonings. I had a hard time trying to interpret what the height would be under the current zoning; I think it is a ratio of how big the buffer zone is and how the adjacent houses are across from it. It looked like theoretically up to one hundred and fifty (150) feet in some portion of that. I would like to have staff confirm that. I do not see that there is a major difference in the height allowed between the two zonings. The one thing we have here that we probably would want to consider is what the Development Agreement says because it is stating limited height, of allowable height is being limited under the Development Agreement to something substantially less than what it might be and I do not know if that Development Agreement restrict height more than it would be under the current zoning, but that is something to consider. Other than that, I am not sure what our purview allows us to do, what percentage of the site can be commercial services versus residential. I would like to have a clarification on that too because comparing one zoning to the other I do not see there is that big a difference between them, in the factors that are important to what we have heard from your testimony today. Again, the one thing I can see may have some impact on those concerns is what the Development Agreement says, so if we could get some clarification on how the Development Agreement impacts that zoning, I would like to hear that.

Britton Wilson: Yes, commissioner both zoning districts pretty much allow the same form when using the large tract plan development process. It is the Development Agreement that is right now requiring a minimum of twenty thousand (20,000) square feet of commercial to be built prior to or at the same time as residential and it is also the Development Agreement that is requiring at least twenty percent (20%) of the residential to be dedicated to the St. Pete's workforce housing program. Without the re-zoning, without the Development Agreement we do not have any guarantee that it will not, that the CCS-1, will not be higher than seven (7) stories and that there will be any workforce housing available.

Commissioner Wolf: Thank you.

Commissioner Nussbaum-Harris: Okay, I have a lot of comments and a lot of thoughts and obviously there are a number of people here who are passionate about their community. A couple of things, this is a community board, we are all private citizens, we have certain guidelines here, we work by, we are here to fulfill, I am new to this board, I have been on it, this is just my second month. I did serve on our Board of Adjustment and our Environmental Development Commission for sixteen (16) years, sixteen (16) years ago, I left when I was pregnant with my daughter, and I am back now. I love to serve the City, I grew up in the south side, I very much understand the challenges, I love in the south side now, we are restricted very much by what it is we can do. There are laws, like what was just mentioned, DRC (Development Review Commission) will review the site plan, and we can only do so much. There is a certain, and it has been a long time since I have used these words, there are certain inherent rights an owner has based under current zoning and the intensity, the density of a development that can be done is pretty great, greater than what is being

proposed. We have competing needs and wants in our community right now, I am very concerned as well about utilizing this large space, kind of like the re-development of former Gas Plant District or to really get it right, I do know that I am a banker, I am just giving you my background, that it takes a certain amount of density and that has changed, the way shopping is today, from what it used to be. To make businesses, to make their model work. We are not in that business to understand what grocers need to make an investment work for them. I do know the City of St. Pete is changing and I do know intensity and density is happening whether we like it or not. The City has, this comes before City Council and our Mayor, we have gone through a lot of changes, with a strong mayor that, St. Pete is going to continue to expand and grow, so it is my intention to see what we can do working with developers and try to meet the needs of our community. I would say to developers here, this is loud and clear what the local community around Coquina Key is looking for and I am really torn. I would like to see the development meeting greater needs, I am concerned with that land disappearing, what else is available. I am sitting here thinking what other shopping centers, what other re-development areas are there. There are other opportunities out there, but that is not what we are here to talk about. We are here to look at this particular request. I am right now very torn, that is where I am at.

Commissioner Wannemacher: Yes, Commissioner Wolf?

Commissioner Wolf : Going back to the fact that our decision is not going to have a whole lot of effect, from a zoning aspect, other than it includes a Development Agreement, I would have a question for the developer about, and I am sure you have done your math and know what works and what does not and we are not experts here to make that work, but I have a question for the developer about if they might be willing to increase the portion of commercial that is addressed in the Development Agreement, to try and at least leave room for the possibility of some kind of a grocery or pharmacy, if it is a small footprint application.

Marc Rios: Sir, we would have to look at the underwriting but, the current design meets the current need. That is how we came to the current design.

Commissioner Wannemacher: Okay, I do have some comments, first, everybody in the audience who came to speak and took time out of your day, thank you very much for coming. Thank you very much for caring about your community, about your neighborhood, about this City we all love it very much and we appreciate that you love it as much as we do as well. Thank you for coming.

Density, the word keeps getting thrown around like it is a bad word. Density is not a bad word; density is solved by good design. We are not here to review the design today, that is not what the issue is. We are here to review a zoning change that will allow the developer to have more flexibility in what they can do and approve a Development Agreement that actually limits what they can do and mandates retail space. If you consider a large forty thousand (40,000) square foot Publix or Winn-Dixie, isn't it made up of several departments inside? You have a florist, you have a pharmacy, maybe a seafood and meat market a bakery, why can't each of these departments be located in individual retail store fronts? They can be and this potentially is what this developer is proposing. One of the speakers mentioned a Trader Joes, you know the Trader Joes up on 4th Street N.? It is only twelve thousand five hundred (12,500) square feet and some Trader Joes are as small as eight thousand (8,000) square feet. The Aldis are about twelve thousand (12,000) square feet,

sometimes you just need to rethink your perception of what a grocery store is. The smaller retail spaces are also more sustainable in terms of their rent and overhead expenses. Many times, they are owned by local businesses, local owners with stronger ties to the community. With all the new residential units that are being developed on the site the new retail businesses will have a more captive audience nearby. I am going to support this application and I would like to see if there are any more comments from the commission or if somebody would like to make a motion.

Motion: Commissioner Whiteman moved approval of the amendment to the Official Zoning Map from Corridor Commercial Suburban (CCS-1) to Corridor Commercial Traditional – 1 (CCT-1) for a 14.5-acre site consisting of two separate parcels located at 4350 6th Street South and 575 45th Ave. S. consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and associated Development Agreement.

Commissioner Brock, Second.

YES – 4 - Wannemacher, Whiteman, Brock, Wolf
NO – 1 - Nussbaum-Harris

Motion passed.

C. City File 22-90200051

Contact People: Kelly Perkins 892-5470

Request: Review of a Certificate of Appropriateness application for a new, two-story, 3,800 SF single-family house at 2101 3rd Ave N, a vacant lot in a local historic district. This application includes a FAR bonus request of .2 FAR.

Staff Presentation

Kelly Perkins gave presentations based on the Staff Report.

Applicant/Agent Presentation

Applicant, Trevor Burgess, gave a presentation in support of the proposed project.

Registered Opponent

Alexander Smith, on behalf of the Historic Kenwood Neighborhood Association in opposition of the proposed project.

Public Hearing

Manny Leto, on behalf of Preserve the ‘Burg, 3302 N. Ridge Ave, opposed
Faihan Malik, 2250 6th Ave. N. opposed
Alexis Baum, 2420 7th Ave. N., opposed
Marla Herrera, 2058 3rd Ave. N., opposed
John Stewart, 2130 Burlington Ave. N., opposed

Mark Carmon, 3127 8th Ave. N., opposed
Luci Westphal, 2310 Burlington Ave. N., opposed
Stephan Gould, 2238 2nd Ave. N., opposed
Caryn Nesmith, 2059 Burlington Ave. N., opposed
Ken Rikard, 2728 3rd Ave. N., opposed
Bryan Young, 2728 3rd Ave. N., opposed
William Herrmann, 130 4th Ave. N., opposed
Jeff Danner, 2351 Dartmouth Ave., opposed
Lisa Presnail, 2042 3rd Ave. N., opposed
Jeanne Roney, 2501 3rd Ave. N., opposed
Terry Wood, 2127 3rd Ave. N., opposed
Jonathan Meyer, 5301 N. Branch Ave., opposed
Kurt Plum 5302 N. Branch Ave., opposed
Katie Klopfenstein, 330 26th St. N., opposed
Sandra Dougherty, 2245 3rd Ave. N., opposed
Lauren Hubbard, 2635 Dartmouth Ave. N., opposed
Melissa Zepeda, 2135 3rd Ave. N., opposed

Cross Examination:

City Staff Waived.

Applicant Burgess: Was the notice that was sent out to residents did it say, and I quote, the house was 3,800 sq. foot single family home?

Commissioner Wannemacher: Ms. Perkins did the notice say three thousand eight hundred (3,800) square feet?

Kelly Perkins: Yes, the notice is the same that is listed on the agenda. We provided the notice to the applicant on July 20th, and they did not bring up any issue with how the project was noticed until August 1st.

Applicant Burgess: Does the house have two thousand eight hundred and eighty seven (2,887) square feet of living space as shown on the front of the plans accepted by the zoning department?

Commissioner Wannemacher: Ms. Perkins the construction documents that have been submitted, what do they indicate?

Kelly Perkins: The floor plans show sheet says two thousand eight hundred and eighty seven (2,887) square feet of conditioned living space. That is not how the city calculates square footage in living space. You use it from the exterior face of the exterior walls with the horizontal plane on each floor.

Commissioner Wannemacher: So, the living space would be calculated from the interior face of the wall?

Kelly Perkins: We do not have the definition of, what is living space, but I was keeping it consistent with the Property Appraiser because he uses the same dimension of the exterior walls and that box that is created.

Commissioner Wannemacher
Okay, thank you. Mr. Burgess? 3:46

Applicant Burgess: Is that true?

Kelly Perkins: Yes.

Applicant Burges: I am sorry, is that true, that is how the property appraiser, does it? My understanding is it is from the inside not the outside.

Commissioner Wannemacher: That I cannot answer but, Ms. Perkins.

Kelly Perkins: My experience, it is taken from the outside.

Commissioner Wannemacher: The outside which is facing.

Kelly Perkins: Looking at my own house...

Commissioner Wannemacher: Which would be the gross square footage? Which is completely different for the livable square footage.

Kelly Perkins: If you look at the property appraiser, they have one column that says livable square footage which includes the interior of the enclosed walls that is considered habitable. Then on the right side they have a column that shows gross area square footage, this includes pretty much everything that has a roof. Front porches, or open porches, screen porches enclosed porches, garage buildings, finished floors, semi-finished, there is a lot of different types that is included in the gross area footage.

Commissioner Wannemacher: An what does the city use to calculate?

Kelly Perkins: What we use the floor area square footage, which is how you calculate the floor area ration and that is the definition of exterior wall, that horizontal plane from the exterior wall face and it also includes any enclosed areas above flood elevation, is my understanding. I am not zoning but that is how I understand it.

Commissioner Wannemacher: Okay, thank you. Mr. Kilborn, do you have anything to add?

Derek Kilborn: No, I was researching the same.

Commissioner Wannemacher: Okay thank you. Mr. Burgess, any other comments?

Applicant Burgess: Is it true that this would be the fifty sixth (56) two story building in Historic Kenwood?

Kelly Perkins: I cannot answer that.

Applicant Burgess: You provided maps that showed the number of two story buildings so I am just trying to make sure that...

Commissioner Wannemacher: You are referencing the 2013 National Register District as being Historic Kenwood or...

Applicant Burgess: No only the highlighted items that staff put on the screen.

Kelly Perkins: There were fourteen (14) two story buildings in the Southeast Local Historic District, this includes single family and multi-family.

Commissioner Wannemacher: Are they truly two story or are they one and a half story and what percentage of them are duplexes or multi-family? I think there needs to be...

Applicant Burgess: Madam Chair I am referring...

Commissioner Wannemacher: Let's be sure we are comparing apples to apples.

Map is now on the screen

Kelly Perkins: So, there are fourteen (14) two story structures, the way staff analyzed it which is based on the staff report, which is consistent with the designation report which was kind of complete second stories. There were eight (8) single family, then there were six (6) multi-family, that are two story. You also have several one story duplexes, six (6) two story duplexes. Back to what we are speaking of in that Southeast, there are fourteen (14) that are in blue, two story homes.

Commissioner Wannemacher: Mr. Burgess you will have time for closing remarks.

Registered Opponent waived.

Rebuttal/Closing Remarks

Kelly Perkins: We addressed somewhat the square footage and how the city estimates square footage, I still standby the numbers that are in my report. I want to go into a little bit about the history that was stated. We first received an email from the owner on April 26th asking if this property needed historic review. We stated yes and tried to discuss a little bit about compatibility and asked if they would like to set up a meeting. They did not take us up on setting up a meeting. They then indicated they planned on submitting an application. We then sent them a memo on May 10th where, I am going to take some excerpts, we wrote, staff finds given this context a one story Craftsman style house would be most appropriate for this infill property. It is possible to sensitively design a two story design for this lot but it would be most appropriate if it read as a one and a half story. We then go into talking about what could be a possible model and then breaking down the two story single family structures. Two days later they submitted the application with

very minor changes. We did request revisions because the plans submitted had an FAR of .61, we could not move that forward without a variance request and variances are tied to the COA per the revised zoning code. You are reviewing one later today that is a COA with a variance. We also had some other minor zoning requirements, and we also need to know what FAR bonuses they were requesting. When we finally did get the revised plans that we could schedule it, they indicated, this is from the applicant, that the CPPC will determine if the owner's proposed design is appropriate, it is understood that the owner and the HPD (Historic Preservation Division) have different opinions, based on this understanding this is why the owner has made some changes to comply with all zoning and some HPD comments. The owner chooses to not change the majority of the proposed plans based on HPD's memo of compatibility concerns. So I think it is slightly incorrect to say that they made all these changes. They made changes regarding zoning, but they have not made changes regarding the memo we provided. What we talk about in the memo, we are really looking at what is the COA criteria, they keep referencing the design guidelines, those give examples of architectural styles found within the St. Petersburg, but we are really reviewing this with the criteria stated that looks around at the contributing resources in that local historic district. Anything further Derek?

Derek Kilborn: No.

Commissioner Wannemacher: Okay, thank you.

Registered Opponents: Again, thank you all for your effort here. We feel that with the facts provided today that we show this building is grossly inappropriate for our neighborhood, it is not even close. The design is out of scale and is two times the size of the average home in the district. It does not fit the size of the homes we fought so hard to protect. It would set a bad precedent for future construction. Again, we are not against new construction, and already have a great example of new construction on a corner lot in a local historic district in Kenwood. Our neighborhood is so successful because our homes are modest in size and encourage us to get outside and enjoy our community. The people within it believe that bigger is not better, we have community over competition. Unfortunately, the design of this proposed structure checks all the wrong boxes, what is the biggest size I can build according to zoning, what is the tallest height I can build according to zoning, how close can I build to my neighbor, what is the minimum setbacks required. Actually if you look specifically to this building, it is actually one foot over the minimum setbacks because of its building height. They cannot claim the ten percent (10%), building height, ten percent (10%), width of lot because the building is over eighteen feet (18) so it actually does need a variance request for the setbacks. How do I know this? I am a license architect, I specialize in historic renovation, I work specifically on 1920s bungalows here in Historic Kenwood. I was the last primary applicant for a local historic district for the Southwest Kenwood Historic District. Just because this building meets the zoning code, does not make it appropriate. Unfortunately, as evidenced, the owner did not go about this the right way. They did not meet with the city for a pre-application meeting, they did not reach out to the Historic Kenwood Neighborhood Association and after they had so much opposition, they actually emailed every single person that had sent in a letter, they sent another email out stating a lot of misinformation about square footage designated, as they have protested here. They called a number of residents and showed up at one of the resident's homes to confront them about the issue. Because of all of this we respectfully request that you deny this application. The massing, scale and context do not meet the criteria set forth in

the local historic district and I ask you to please to vote no.

Applicant Burgess: First of all, I would like to say I do not know who showed up because it was not one of us who showed up at someone's house. Did we send out an email to people saying what the right square footage was, yes. You tell someone in this day and age on Zillow that a house is thirty eight thousand (3,800) square feet guess what, they are going to think it is thirty eight thousand square feet. This house is two thousand eight hundred and eighty seven (2,887) square feet, as people think about the size of their house. I feel sorry for everyone coming in here coming up against this because I too, if the house was a thousand (1,000) square feet more than I thought it was I might be upset, that is a big house. We showed pictures of the other corner houses, three of them are bigger than ours. Corners in general in Kenwood, in historic areas, are bigger. We showed pictures of them, and we looked up on the property appraisers website their square footage. We did follow everything, we did carefully go through all nineteen (19) required items and we showed that we did meet the code, not just zoning, but the code. A lot of what I heard today is the people wish the rule was different, people wish that you could only build a bungalow, that is not what the law says. If we would like to change the law, then change the law, and say we can only build a bungalow, it is not what the codes says. We followed the code and the city's official guidelines. We have proven that there were a lot of mistakes in the staff's report, I hope they were not intentional but when you send out something saying a house is thirty eight thousand (3,800) square feet to everybody, without giving the living square footage that is misleading to people and it is going to get a lot of people angry and it has. This is not some developer who is trying to flip a home and make money, this is for a nice gay couple moving from Tamps who are trying to live here in St. Pete. This home was designed to be historically sensitive we picked a vernacular that people do not like, I am sorry, but it is one of the vernaculars allowed, it is historic vernacular, and it is a vernacular that appears in Kenwoods four historic districts. John and Jean-luc will make amazing additions to your homes, one of their neighbors came but they had to leave, he came here from Tampa to tell you how angry he was that they are leaving. You will look back and say, this was a real mistake. We are not going to design another home, if this doesn't work out, we will just sell the lot, got two blocks away and build new. Then this lot will continue to be vacant. Staff developed their own guide for this particular house, they sent it to us, and said, this is what we gave the previous developer who was looking at this lot. Guess what, the developer did not buy the lot and did not build a house. It has been vacant for five years, since the last home was torn down. Here you get the opportunity for a builder to build his own hose for his family in a historically sensitive way. Is it a product of its own time, absolutely is, there is a home office, there is air conditioning. The height makes sense for the way homes are built today. Over ninety percent of homes in St. Petersburg are two stories, new construction, that is just the way it is. That is a product of the time, that is what cade calls for. Again, I am sorry that everyone thought it was a thirty eight thousand (3,800) square foot house and came out pitchforks going, that just is not the case, it is two thousand eight hundred and eighty seven (2,887) living square feet. That is how people think about their homes and that is what we are trying to build here, thank you.

Executive Session

Discussion was had regarding the square footage of the house, closed square footage and how the city code states from exterior wall to exterior wall. The difference between the National Register and how the Local Kenwood Historic District is more definitive with clear characteristics. How

the mass and scale of the proposed project is out of scale with the neighborhood. If the home was 2,887 square feet, it would still be much larger than what would be the second largest home in the neighborhood. The projects inconsistency with the Certificate of Appropriateness guidelines, concern of setting precedent, and a suggestion to reach out to the neighborhood association. The charm and character of the neighborhood, the defining elements of the community and how the commission must weigh those when looking at a proposed project. The passion of the community and their fight to get the neighborhood designated and the higher standard that must be achieved because of the fight to have the neighborhood designate and the commission cannot weigh in on what the market dictates the finances and pro forma of the proposed home should be.

Motion: Commissioner Whiteman moved approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness application for a new, two-story, 3,800 SF single-family house at 2101 3rd Ave N, a vacant lot in a local historic district. This application includes a FAR bonus request of .2 FAR., subject to staff conditions.

Commissioner Wolf, Second.

YES – 0

NO – 7 - Wannemacher, Moultrie, Nussbaum-Harris, Whiteman, Brock, Michaels, Wolf

Motion failed.

D. City File 22-90200063

Contact People: Kelly Perkins 892-5470

Request: Review of a Certificate of Appropriateness application for a two-story garage with ADU at 2051 Burlington Ave N, a contributing property to a local historic district

Staff Presentation

Kelly Perkins gave presentations based on the Staff Report.

Applicant/Agent Presentation

Applicant, Chad Holman, General Contractor, was available for comments or questions.

Registered Opponent

None.

Public Hearing

Calin Noonan, 2039 & 2051 Burlington N., indicate he was in support

Cross Examination:

City Staff and Applicant Waived.

Rebuttal/Closing Remarks

City Staff and Applicant Waived.

Executive Session

The commissioners discussed that they agreed the block below and siding above would break up the mass, the preference to see the differentiation of material because it differentiates the program which is contained inside, the first floor mass and the second floor mass, the ground floor is a garage and the second floor is living quarters

Motion: Commissioner Wolf moved approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness application for a two-story garage with ADU at 2051 Burlington Ave N, a contributing property to a local historic district, subject to Staff conditions.

Commissioner Whiteman, Second.

YES – 7 - Wannemacher, Moultrie, Nussbaum-Harris, Whiteman, Brock, Michaels, Wolf

NO – 0

Motion passed unanimously.

E. City File 22-90200064 & 22-90200065 Contact People: Laura Duvekot 892-5451

Request: 22-90200064: Review of a Certificate of Appropriateness application for the demolition of a detached garage building at 2034 Burlington Ave N, a contributing property to a local historic district

22-90200065: Review of a Certificate of Appropriateness application for the construction of a garage with ADU at 2034 Burlington Ave N, a contributing property to a local historic district

Staff Presentation

Laura Duvekot gave presentations based on the Staff Report.

Applicant/Agent Presentation

Applicant, Chad Holman, General Contractor, was available for comments or questions.

Registered Opponent

None.

Public Hearing

Calin Noonan, 2039 & 2051 Burlington N., indicate he was in support

Cross Examination:

City Staff and Applicant Waived.

Rebuttal/Closing Remarks

City Staff and Applicant Waived.

Executive Session

Commissioner expressed concern regarding general criteria number three (3) and four (4), of the staff report. The staff report included the following language: Criterion number three (3), the subject district will be affected by the accumulation of loss of its small-scale accessory buildings as this type of demolition request becomes more frequent. The loss of this building as well as numerous similar structures will eventually affect the integrity of the subject district as a whole. General criterion number four (4) staff would likely recommend that the owner further explore the possibility of rehabilitation if the proposed use of the building were to remain as garage space. possible bad precedent in allowing the demolition and rebuilding of the subject property. Best practices and preserving, rehabilitating the building, is ideal, however not always possible. Discussion was had regarding the fence, possibility of a new fence permit and what would save the time of the applicant.

Motion #1: Commissioner moved Whiteman approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness Application for the demolition of a detached garage building and an application for the construction of a garage with ADU at 2034 Burlington Ave N., subject to Staff conditions.

Commissioner Wolf, Second.

***YES – 6 - Wannemacher, Moultrie, Nussbaum-Harris, Whiteman, Brock,
Wolf***

NO – 1 - Michaels

Motion passes.

Motion #2: Commissioner moved Whiteman approval of a Certificate of for the construction of a garage with ADU at 2034 Burlington Ave N, a contributing property to a local historic district subject

Commissioner Wolf, Second.

***YES – 7 - Wannemacher, Moultrie, Nussbaum-Harris, Whiteman, Brock,
Michaels, Wolf***
NO – 0

F. City File 22-90200082

Request: Review of a Certificate of Appropriateness application for a front fence and driveway.

Laura Duvekot gave presentations based on the Staff Report.

Applicant, William Oliver, III, was unavailable for comments or questions.

None.

None.

City Staff and Applicant Waived.

City Staff and Applicant Waived.

The commission discussed conditions of approval, specifically number three (3), modifying “gate” to read “driveway gate” and “pedestrian gate” guaranteeing that both gates are reviewed by staff. The fence panels in the site plan being set back three (3) feet and identified that way in condition number four (4) and identifying how far the columns need to be setback as the columns look to be set back only one (1) foot back and adding column language to the conditions of approval.

Motion: *Commissioner Whiteman moved approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness application for a front fence and driveway, subject to Staff conditions and amending condition number four (4) to add, centered on the columns. Changing condition three (3) to differentiate the driveway gate and the sidewalk gate.*

Commissioner Brock, Second.

*YES – 7 - Wannemacher, Moultrie, Nussbaum-Harris, Whiteman, Brock,
Michaels, Wolf*

NO – 0

Motion passed unanimously.

G. City File 22-90200041

Contact People: Kelly Perkins 892-5470

Request: Review of a Certificate of Appropriateness application for alterations at 1001 Bay St NE, a contributing property to a local historic district.

Staff Presentation

Kelly Perkins gave presentations based on the Staff Report.

Applicant/Agent Presentation

Applicant, Dorman “Trey” Payne, Contractor, gave a presentation

Registered Opponent

None.

Public Hearing

Robin Reed, on behalf of the Historic Old Northeast Neighborhood Association, 705 16th Ave NE. spoke in opposition of the project regarding all the after the fact demolitions and setting precedent regarding after the fact approvals.

Glen Fish, Sr. spoke in support of the project.

Glen Fish, Jr. spoke in support of the project.

Cross Examination:

City Staff Waived.

Applicant: Asked to look at documentation in the COA, and asked for confirmation that they did make efforts to communicate throughout the process. Ms. Perkins agreed, several phone conversations and meeting throughout the process.

Rebuttal/Closing Remarks

Kelly Perkins: Clarified that she indicated during the phone calls and meetings that much of the work that had already been done could have been approved on a staff level, including the replacement of the non-historic windows, many of the issues brought before the commission was due to a lack of permits and COA. She stressed the need for permits prior to doing construction and a COA prior to the permit.

Applicant, Trey Payne: Spoke to his understanding that they were trying to get everything under one COA instead of piecing it out and reiterated the importance of securing the structure and preventing further water intrusion. He clarified they do have a permit, but the revision is not in the current permit. They have since obtained signed and sealed plans as of yesterday.

Executive Session

Discussion was had regarding the partial denial of an after-the fact demolition, codes compliance, ongoing codes issues, and denial to removing the siding. Denial of the after the fact destruction of a wall, approval of the construction of a new wall, as well as approval of the new siding. The lack of permits for the work preformed and work going forward. The shed roof, not being constructed as of yet, the windows approved previously, do not have exterior muntins and the replacement of the incorrect windows with the correct muntins. The possible deterioration of the building if the applicant had not done work without the proper permitting and all of the requests and conditions from staff. Lastly, the clarification regarding the setback/reveal of the windows to be installed. Approving the partial denial and time delays with the proposed work. 5:37 – 5:

Motion #1: Commissioner Brock moved to amend the staff recommendations to delete the recommendation of partial denial in its entirety. Applicant withdrew the request for the eight light and agreed to the originally approved Certificate of Appropriateness to the six light window.

Commissioner Michaels, Second.

***YES – 6 - Wannemacher, Moultrie, Nussbaum-Harris, Whiteman, Brock,
Michaels***

NO – 0

Motion passes unanimously.

Motion #2: Commissioner Whiteman move approval of the a after the fact demolition of the side street wall and approval of the after the fact removal of the siding

Nussbaum-Harris, Second

***YES – 6 - Wannemacher, Moultrie, Nussbaum-Harris, Whiteman, Brock,
Michaels***

NO – 0

Motion passed unanimously.

Motion #3: *Commissioner Brock moved approval of the Certificate of Appropriateness with staff recommendations as amended.*

Commissioner Whiteman, Second.

*YES – 6 - Wannemacher, Moultrie, Nussbaum-Harris, Whiteman, Brock,
Michaels*

NO – 0

Motion passed unanimously.

H. City File 22-90200050

Contact People: Laura Duvekot 892-5451

Request: Review of a Certificate of Appropriateness application for the installation of metal and vinyl fencing and fabric awnings at 236 10th Ave NE, a contributing property to a local historic district

Staff Presentation

Laura Duvekot gave presentations based on the Staff Report.

Applicant/Agent Presentation

Applicant, A Voice from a High, LLC. was unavailable for comment.

Registered Opponent

None.

Public Hearing

Robin Reed, on behalf of the Historic Old Northeast Neighborhood Association, 705 16th Ave NE. expressed concern about the front yard fence.

Cross Examination:

City Staff Waived.

Rebuttal/Closing Remarks

City Staff Waived.

Executive Session

A discussion was had regarding the frames of the proposed awnings, the proposal was for metal frames with canvas awnings which will be covered on all three sides of the awning. The aluminum vertical picket fence

Motion: *Commissioner Brock moved approval of the Certificate of Appropriateness subject to Staff conditions.*

Commissioner Moultrie, Second.

YES – 5 - Wannemacher, Moultrie, Nussbaum-Harris, Whiteman, Brock
NO – 0

Motion passed unanimously.

I. City File 22-90200050

**Contact People: Ann Vickstrom, 892-5807, and
Laura Duvekot 892-5451**

Request:

COA 22-90200066: Review of a Certificate of Appropriateness application for:

- Rear addition,
- Replacement of non-historic windows, and
- Expansion of/alteration to front porch

at 705 18th Ave NE, a contributing property to a local historic district.

Variance 22-54000052: Approval of a 3-feet variance to the front yard setback from 23-feet to 20-feet for an uncovered, open front porch; and a 3-feet variance from 20-feet to 17-feet for the front stoop at the property of 705 18th Avenue NE.

Staff Presentation

Laura Duvekot and Ann Vickstrom gave presentations based on the Staff Report.

Applicant/Agent Presentation

Applicants, Kimberly Bradley and Iain Hoyte spoke briefly and were available for questions.

Registered Opponent

Robin Reed, on behalf of Historic Old Northeast Neighborhood Association spoke in favor

Public Hearing

None.

Cross Examination:

City Staff and Applicant Waived.

Rebuttal/Closing Remarks

City Staff and Applicant Waived.

Executive Session

The commissioners mentioned the variance for the porch is in line with the neighborhood.

Motion: ***Commissioner Nussbaum-Harris moved approval of the 3-feet variance to the front yard setback from 23-feet to 20-feet for an uncovered, open front porch; and a 3-feet variance from 20-feet to 17-feet for the front stoop and a Certificate of Appropriateness application for a rear addition, replacement of non-historic windows, and expansion of/alteration to front porch at the property of 705 18th Avenue NE., subject to the condition in the Staff report.***

Commissioner Whiteman, Second.

YES – 5 - Wannemacher, Moultrie, Nussbaum-Harris, Whiteman, Brock
NO – 0

Motion passed unanimously.

VIII. UPDATES AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

IX. ADJOURN

With no further items to come before the Commission, the public hearing was adjourned at 8:15 pm.